REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-25 were pending. New claims 26-52 are added. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 11, 13-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to a non-statutory subject matter. To the extent that the Office's argument is understood by the applicant, it appears that the Office has overlooked the governing law of the Federal Circuit and the U.S. Supreme Court and simply concluded that "[c]omputer programs are not statutory." Indeed, it is telling that the Office has failed to cite a single authority in support of this conclusion. In any event, methods whose steps are performed by a computer are indeed patentable as well computer program products embodying those steps. See, e.g., *In re Pardo*, 684 F.2d 912 (CCPA 1982); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 11, 13-16 and 18-20 recite statutory subject matter.

Withdrawn Claims

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-25 are withdrawn from consideration for allegedly being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The applicant does not concede to the withdrawal of these claims. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicant has added new claims.

Independent claim 26 recites in part, associating a first set of time values in the time period with one or more parameter values... associating a second set of time values with the parameter values in the time period, the second set of time values being different from the first set of time values. The cited portions in the office action dated July 2, 2007, of "Adobe After effects Help: Stylized Effects" (hereinafter "Adobe"), as understood by the applicant, do not teach or suggest associating time values with parameter values.

Applicant : Jason T. Bartell et al.
Serial No. : 10/696,740
Filed : October 28, 2003
Page : 13 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-603001 / P556

The portions relied upon by the examiner are reproduced as follows:

Stroke Length Specifies the length, in seconds, of the stroke at any moment. …
Change the stroke length at keyframes to make the length of the stroke expand
and contract as it is shown.

Brush Time Properties Specifies whether brush properties (color and opacity)
are applied to each stroke segment or to the entire stroke. …

(p.218). Stroke length in Adobe is understood to disclose the specifying of length
(position) in seconds (time). Brush time properties in Adobe are understood to disclose the
specifying of properties (parameter values) applied to stroke segments (position). Neither of
these ideas are understood to be an association between parameter values and time, much less
associating a second set of time values with parameter values. Accordingly, claim 26 and its
dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Claims 35-52 are in condition for allowance
for at least the same reason.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:__April 25, 2008_____   /Daniel J. Burns/_____
                                               Daniel J. Burns
                                               Reg. No. 50,222

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50463784.doc